

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Applicant thanks Examiner Redman for his continued attention to this application.

Although the rejection argues that Mesnel discloses a one-piece elastomeric weather seal comprising two U-shaped reinforced metal core mounting elements attached to a door frame, hollow sealing lips, flocking on the hollow sealing lips, flocking on a bottom portion forming the channel for guiding a window pane, and retaining lips projecting from the U-shaped reinforced mounting elements, the rejection appears to acknowledge that Mesnel fails to disclose an integral one-piece elastomeric weather seal.

Not only does Mesnel fail to disclose an integral seal as claimed, Mesnel teaches away from such a construction. In his discussion of the prior art, Mesnel specifically addresses the failure of the art to provide seals that can be easily installed.

In his summary of the invention, Mesnel discusses the advantages of using a pair of separate shaped gripping and covering frame elements (1 and 2) as shown in the Figures, that are capable of providing a simple and automatic method of installation and fastening of the sealing frame elements in the opening. There can be no doubt that Mesnel is talking about two separate elements and the drawing confirms this. Mesnel then goes on to describe a spacer brace 5 positioned between the elements but limited to the upper part and two side parts of the circumference of the window. The spacer brace is simultaneously tightened as the separate elements 1 and 2 are installed and the spacer brace has flocking on the interface thereof against which the glass window abuts. This would not be possible with a one piece seal. The separateness of the sealing frame elements 1 and 2 is reinforced at lines 39 et seq.

where it is described that one or both of the sealing elements may be provided with a decorative strip. Figure 2 for example, even more clearly shows the separateness of elements 1 and 2 if there was any doubt from the other Figures.

Mesnel specifically distinguishes his invention from the one-piece weather seal of the prior art shown in Figure 7.

Thus, the proposed combination of Schroder with Mesnel is contrary to the explicit teachings of Mesnel.

Although the Examiner rejects claim 14 on the same basis as claim 1, claim 14 includes additional limitations not found in the cited art. The Examiner has made no mention of any of the limitations in claim 14 not found in claim 1 among which are the spaced inner and outer flanges and middle segment, the door-cavity section, the connection between the middle segment and inner flange and first guiding portion, the spacing between the base portion and an inner like portion and outer like portion, and a second guiding portion of the contact surface areas being configured in two directions.

Applicant submits that claim 14 and the associated depending claims are arguable for these reasons in addition to the reasons already discussed in connection with claim 1.

Claims 2 and 15 are rejected over Mesnel, Schroder and Herr, but Herr does not provide any of the basic elements missing from Mesnel and Schroder, nor does Herr provide any independent basis for combining Mesnel and Schroder contrary to the expressed teachings of Mesnel.

Claims 19 and 22 are rejected over Mesnel, Schroder and Oda, but again, Oda is substantially different from any of the other references and does not show or

suggest any of the limitations missing from the basic references Mesnel and Schroder nor does it suggest any independent basis for combining those references contrary to the teachings of Mesnel.

Each of the matters raised in the Office Action having been addressed, reconsideration and favorable action are requested.

Respectfully submitted,



Stephen B. Salai, Registration No. 26,990
Customer Number 23387
HARTER SECREST & EMERY LLP
1600 Bausch & Lomb Place
Rochester, New York 14604
Telephone: 585-232-6500
Fax: 585-232-2152